Town of Mansfield
CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Meeting of 16 June 2010
Conference B, Audrey P. Beck Building
MINUTES

Members present: Quentin Kessel, John Silander, Frank Trainor. *Members absent*: Robert Dahn, Peter Drzewiecki, Scott Lehmann, Joan Stevenson. *Others present:* Grant Meitzler (Wetlands Agent), Neil Faccinetti.

1. The meeting was **called to order** at 7:35p by Chair Quentin Kessel.

2. The draft **minutes of the 19 May 2010 were** tabled for lack of a quorum.

3. IWA Referral W1455 – St. Jean – Hickory Lane. This is an application for an above- ground pool in the buffer without a permit. It appears to have been in place for some time, perhaps years. Meitzler indicated he had no problem with the location of the pool. The CC declined to comment on this referral. Silander noted that there seems to be no penalty for not obtaining a permit before executing a project such as this.

4. IWA referral: (UConn DEP Application). The CC reviewed the application for utility work between Lakeside apartments and the Towers dormitories. It was provided to the CC for informational purposes, and after review it was decided not to make any comments.

5. New Appointments. It was agreed to forward the names of Neil Faccinetti and Joan Buck to the Town Manager for consideration for appointments to the CC as alternate members. A poll of members at the last meeting and by email supported these appointments unanimously.

6. UConn Agronomy Farm Irrigation Project. Faccinetti and Kessel reported on the June Town/Gown meeting to which UConn's Eugene Roberts, Jason Coite and other representatives made a presentation on the project, which was followed by a lengthy question and answer session. Within a short time, various well monitors will be in place and a webpage showing the results will be established. UConn will also name a contact person for residents with additional questions. This exchange of information was felt to be very useful.

7. PZC Proposed Zoning Regulation Revisions. Lehmann submitted the CC's comments on Invasive plant species, aquifer and public water supply well protection and the Pleasant Valley Rezoning to the hearing and Kessel attended to make certain they became part of the public hearing record.

8. UConn drainage issues. Kessel distributed copies of the CC letter to the DEP responding to Rich Miller's 4/20/10 letter to DEP's Denise Ruzicka, which was reviewed at the May CC meeting. It was agreed, subject to editorial changes, to send it. The CEQ will be discussing this at their next meeting.

9. Eagleville Brook TMDL. A public information session on steps to reduce pollution and sedimentation in Eagleville Brook was held 6/4/10. Lehmann attended this meeting

and his report is attached, including a later email comment from UConn's Miller.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Quentin Kessel, Secretary *pro tem.* Approved 21 July 2010.

ATTACHMENT.
From: Scott Lehmann
Re: Impervious Cover TMDL Project
Date: 04 June 2010

I attended the "Update and Discussion on the Impervious Cover TMDL Project" for Eagleville Brook at UConn this morning, hoping for some clarity on the role of the Swan Lake diversion. Here is what I learned.

- DEP is using the percentage of impervious cover (%IC) in the watershed as a proxy for stream quality. Studies of aquatic life communities in various watersheds suggest that streams with %IC < 12 are sufficiently pollution-free {at the outlet, I guess}, so the DEP has adopted a target %IC of 11 for the Eagleville Brook watershed.
- The alternative of setting TMDL for each of various pollutants is costly and inefficient, since many of these don't have easily identifiable sources, but find their way into streams in runoff from roads, parking lots, roofs, and the like during storms. The idea is that reducing %IC will reduce the volume of runoff and therefore its pollution load of whatever.
- Study of the Eagleville Brook watershed revealed a %IC of 13.8. To reach the 11% target, 33 acres of IC must be "disconnected" from Eagleville Brook, so that runoff from it goes instead into groundwater or wetlands. Numerous small projects are underway to achieve this reduction (and more): permeable pavement in parking lots, green roofs, rain-gardens, artificial wetlands, etc.
- The %IC proxy for stream quality is to be evaluated in the case of Eagleville Brook by studies of aquatic life as %IC reductions are achieved.
- "Disconnecting" IC by exporting runoff to another drainage is *not* part of this project. Responding to a question about the Swan Lake diversion from Denise Burchsted, the TMDL Project Team completely disowned reducing %IC by diverting runoff from the upper Eagleville Brook drainage to the Fenton River drainage.
- According to Rich Miller, with whom I spoke after the session ended, UConn's Drainage Master Plan is a completely separate project, though it also aims to reduce the volume of stormwater runoff and consequent erosion and sedimentation. The Plan antedates the TMDL project, having been devised in 2003-04 (after prodding from DEP) to address increased runoff from UConn 2000 construction. The rationale for the Swan Lake diversion is not to improve water quality in Eagleville Brook, but to reduce the volume of runoff into it.
- Miller indicated that water quality issues will be addressed before water is diverted to the Fenton watershed. It may be possible to avoid the Swan Lake diversion entirely by improving infiltration at W-lot, but this would require amending the MOA. {Presumably, if DPH vetoes the discharge, the MOA would have to be amended.}
- The northern part of W-lot now drains, via drains and pipes, to the Fenton watershed, although this lot is in the Eagleville Brook watershed. This portion of W-lot is not included in the %IC assessment of the Eagleville Brook watershed,

because it has been engineered out of it.

Sent Sunday, June 06, 2010 7:19 AM

Well done, Scott. This is not easy stuff to grasp, especially on your first pass.

I wonder if I could amend my comment (in your next to last bullet) to read "...this may require an addendum to the MOA..." instead of "...this would require an amendment to the MOA..." It's possible that DEP could significantly scale down the stormwater diversion project through the inidividual flood management certification (permitting) process, which we're still about 3 or 4 years away from commencing, based on significant changes to the actual drainage calculations. These calculations are the technical basis for an individual FMC. And, it's my understanding that these drainage calculations could be significantly changed by the TMDL projects, especially the proposed "W-Lot improvements project" that is already identified as one of our top 10 TMDL projects (I'll try to make it our highest priority). There was some discussion during the meeting about whether this would hold true for larger storm events (e.g., 50- and 100-year storms), which is part of the required FMC drainage analysis. For example, we now know that the area of stormwater to be diverted is actually 43 acres, not 55 acres, based on the finding described in your last bullet. So the MOA is already inaccurate in that respect.

Regards,
Rich